

COPY



EXHIBIT #12

28 Grafton Common
Grafton, MA 01519
Ph: (508) 466-7120
September 22, 2017

SEP 27 2017

**PLANNING BOARD
GRAFTON, MA**

Dear Mr. Scully and the Grafton Planning Board:

I would like to express a number of my concerns regarding the proposed Verizon Wireless cell tower being placed within the Grafton Congregational Church, the centerpiece of our town. My name is Barbara Rugo Focht, M.D. and my husband and I own two properties that directly abut the Congregational Church, in addition to our residence on Sibley Street in Grafton. On the one side of the church we own 28 Grafton Common, in which I have run my pediatric practice for since 2011.

I currently care for over 2500 patients, ranging in age from premature newborns through young adults. On the other side of the church we own the house at 1 Church Street, in which reside two premedical students who are working in my practice. Any changes, therefore, that take place within the Congregational Church will deeply affect me personally.

Though my deepest concerns with the proposed cell tower are health related, it is my understanding the health concerns are the weakest arguments in town hearings, thanks to the FCC. So I will begin by addressing some of the other concerns first.

Cell towers add an increased risk of lightening strikes, and therefore an increased risk of fire. How negligent it would be if the original building around which our town was founded would come to preventable harm. Lightening strikes could also disable important computer systems of surrounding businesses,

It is my understanding that Massachusetts law states that, should a town allow one cell phone company to put up a tower in a particular area, requests for the same coming from other cell phone companies must also be honored. Are we opening Pandora's box? Do we want multiple cell towers littered throughout the historic district and surrounding areas?

Are we willing to tolerate the added noise and light pollution that a Verizon Wireless generator, lights, and equipment will cause? Is it fair that residents living next to the quiet Historic District will now have to bear this? There is also literature showing that property values of homes go down after cell towers are erected near them.

I question whether Verizon Wireless even has any actual gaps in coverage in this area of Grafton. None of my staff nor I have ever had any problems with cell coverage at 28 Grafton Common. I have never had any poor coverage with my Verizon Wireless phone at either 1 Church Street nor 31 Sibley Street. If coverage is adequate there should be no reason to even consider this proposal. Has Verizon Wireless been required to show the Town of Grafton proof that there is, in fact, significant gaps in coverage? And where are those gaps?

Many insurance companies are now placing disclaimers on their liability should future harm come from cell towers. This may have been driven by future health concerns but may also be related to risks of lightening strikes or fire. So the question should be raised in advance. Should harm come to anyone in the future because of this proposed cell tower, who will be deemed responsible? The church's insurance? The Congregational Church itself? Or will the Town of Grafton, for allowing it to be installed?

What will happen when this cell tower technology becomes obsolete (which it most certainly will)?

Who would be responsible for its costly removal? How would we guarantee now that this will happen then? And has the Congregational Church considered that it may lose its nonprofit status after accepting "rent money" from Verizon Wireless?

Finally, though the FCC has tried to render health concerns as not pertinent, we all recognize that they are ethically of critical importance. This is particularly true when those who are the most vulnerable to those dangers are our babies and children. As a pediatrician I am well aware that all health risks from environmental toxins are magnified in our children. Lead exposure causes the most brain damage in young children. Lung cancer is most likely in those who started smoking cigarettes at an early age. Sunburns greatly increase the risk of skin cancer, especially if they occurred during childhood. And the research is showing that the youngest children exposed to cell phone and cell tower radiation face the greatest increased risks of cancers, infertility, cognitive delays, and other health issues. The World Health Organization lists cell technology as a Class 2B carcinogen.

There is scientific research that suggests that all cell towers be placed at least ¼ mile from people, and at least ½ mile from any people who may have compromised health. Directly next door to the proposed site I serve 2,500 children (and their families) many of who have a variety of health problems. My current patients include a toddler with leukemia, 3 infants with complicated syndromes, 4 premature babies weighing less than 5 pounds, 11 children with Down Syndrome, 7 children with Cystic Fibrosis...and the list goes on. Certainly the health and well being of these children and their families should enter into the decision-making.

I ask you to take all of these issues into consideration as you determine the future of our town. I understand people's selfish desires for more perfect cell coverage, should that need in fact even exist. I understand that the Congregational Church has been struggling financially, and that this potential source of income is being viewed as a blessing. But, for these priorities to take precedence over the health, welfare, and safety of our citizens, is unethical and unconscionable. I ask you to keep our most vulnerable babies and children in your mind as you enter into the decision making process.

Passionately,

Barbara Rugo Facht, M.D.

SEP 27 2017

**PLANNING BOARD
GRAFTON, MA**

Navigation

Introduction
The Science
Military Experts
Doubts
Cancers
Infertility
Impact on Children
Wi-Fi in Schools
Electrohypersensitiv...
(EHS)
Utility "Smart" Meters
Planetary Impact
Manufacturers
For Engineers &
Physicists
For Municipal Leaders
5G & IoT
Media Limitations
World Response
Solutions
Massachusetts EMF
Bills
State House
Journey
Expert Video Clips
Books
Documentaries
Contact

Legal Issues

Insurance Industries and Manufacturers

Insurance companies recognize EMFs as an emerging risk and are excluding coverage.

- In 2015 Lloyd's of London excluded liability for injuries from EMFs. See page 8, exclusion 32 on Electromagnetic fields:

<https://www.scribd.com/document/261610831/Insurance-AE-CFC-Underwriting-Limited-Lloyds-Latest-Version-February-7th-2015>

- AM Best, an insurance rating company, warns about financial risks for emerging technologies, including wireless radiation:

<http://www.ambest.com/directories/bestconnect/EmergingRisks.pdf>

- Insurer Swiss Re also indicates liability from increased EMFs on page 21, paragraph three, in their Smart Cities discussion:

http://media.swissre.com/documents/SONAR_2014.pdf

- The following link provides a summary of legal implications for the insurance industry and manufacturers:

<https://groups.google.com/forum/m/#!topic/galisteo-wireless/VQzrsx3QgY>

Dr. Devra Davis explains the legal ramifications in a lecture to Australia's New South Wales University Law School in November 2015. She is joined by renowned neurosurgeon Dr. Charlie Teo for the Question and Answer segment where he calls for National Cell Phone Right To Know Legislation:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lzfoGy917yA>

- TalkMarkets provided a market analysis in the 2017 article, "A Coming Storm for Wireless?":

<http://www.talkmarkets.com/content/stocks--equities/a-coming-storm-for-wireless?post=143501>

Lawsuits

There is an increasing number of legal cases stemming from EMF health concerns:

- In 2017, an Italian employee was awarded monthly social security payments after a court found his brain tumor was caused by improper use of a company-issued cellphone. Of particular note, the court's expert refused to accept into evidence studies that were funded by the telecom industry:

<http://bigstory.ap.org/article/0cf4831aca2c451aba0612ba199cac70/italian-court-finds-link-between-cell-phone-use-and-tumor>

- In May 2015 Berkeley, California passed an historic right to know ordinance to ensure consumers know what is in the fine print in the legal section of their user manual:

"The City of Berkeley requires that you be provided the following notice:

To assure safety, the Federal Government requires that cell phones meet radio frequency (RF) exposure guidelines. If you carry or use your phone in a pants or shirt pocket or tucked into a bra when the phone is ON and connected to a wireless network, you may exceed the federal guidelines for exposure to RF radiation. This potential risk is greater for children.

Refer to the instructions in your phone or user manual for information about how to use your phone safely."

- CTIA-The Wireless Industry sued three times to block this legislation, and lost. Note, the one judge who did not support the Berkeley ordinance is married to a telecom company employee working on 5G wireless infrastructure design. See the Rueter's article for a summary of the 2017 ruling:

<http://www.reuters.com/article/us-otc-speech-idUSKBN17Q262>

- **Law Letter: "Small Cell" Bill Will Shift Liability and Reasonably Result in Bankruptcy of California.** Submitted as testimony on SB.649: <https://ehitrust.org/law-letter-small-cell-bill-will-shift-liability-reasonably-result-bankruptcy-california-sb649/>
- **Cell phone lawsuits:** <http://www.saferemr.com/2014/08/major-breakthrough-in-cellphone.html>
- **Canadian Class Action Smart Meter Lawsuit:** <http://emfsafetynetwork.org/class-action-lawsuit-filed-against-bc-hydro-smart-meters/>
- In 2015, a family with a son diagnosed with electrohypersensitivity (EHS) filed a lawsuit in the U.S. District Court seeking protection under the Americans with Disabilities Act from The Fay School in Southborough, Massachusetts:

www.networkworld.com/article/2975945/mobile-wireless/massachusetts-boarding-school-fay-southborough-sued-over-wi-fi-sickness.html

- Dr. Devia Davis explains the legal ramifications in a lecture to Australia's New South Wales University Law School on 11/2015. She is joined by renowned neurosurgeon Dr. Charlie Teo on stage for the Q and A where he calls for **National Cell Phone Right To Know Legislation**:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IzfoGy917yA>

- Dr. Joel Moskowitz at the University of California, Berkeley sued California, and won, under the Freedom of Information Act because the Department of Public Health refused to provide a copy of a cell phone hazard public fact sheet they developed years ago but never released. Following are the fact sheet and media coverage:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B14R6QNkmaXuRmJIZDRWME5IN2M/view>

<http://www.sfgate.com/news/article/Judge-may-order-release-of-state-health-report-on-10973430.php>

<http://sanfrancisco.cbslocal.com/2017/03/02/cellphone-radiation-exposure-fact-sheet-draft-released-by-california-health-officials/>

Disability

- In August 2015, the first person in France was provided **disability compensation for electrohypersensitivity (EHS)**:
- In Grenoble, France, a judge ordered the **"smart" water meter be replaced** with a non-radiation-emitting meter at the home of a person who is electrosensitive in November 2016. Below is a roughly translated article:

<http://www.buergerwelle.de/8080/helma/twoday/bwnews/stories/6753/>

http://www.lepoint.fr/societe/compteur-d-eau-intelligent-une-electrosensible-obtient-son-retrait-09-12-2016-2089186_23.php

- In 2016, the High Court of Madrid found in favor of an EHS sufferer, an ex-employee of the telecommunications company Ericsson:

<http://mieuxprevenir.blogspot.co.uk/2016/08/spain-high-court-of-madrid-ruling.html>

Workers Compensation

- "The **WHO/IARC report** has the potential of causing a major new wave of workers' compensation claims for cancer," reports WorkersCompensation.com:

- An Australian scientist was awarded workers compensation for Wi-Fi pain:

<http://www.news.com.au/technology/csiro-scientist-dr-david-mcdonald-wins-compensation-for-wifi-pain/news-story/0a2abc1814dca200d9e54b05f810c8f5>

Teachers Unions

- Teachers unions are recognizing the risks of wi-fi in their work environment and are seeking protection:

<http://www.parentsforsafetechnology.org/teacher-unions-parent-teacher-organizations.html>

- See also the attached position paper from Ontario English Catholic Teachers Association.

Note: The information provided here is publicly available on the Internet.

It is intended to provide a starting point to inform you of EMF dangers.

Please do your own research, draw your own conclusions, and act accordingly to protect those you love.



WiFipositionpaper2 OE... Cecelia Doucette,

v.1



**PLANNING BOARD
GRAFTON, MA**

Examining invisible urban pollution and its effect on real estate value in New York City
(<http://nyrej.com/examining-invisible-urban-pollution-and-its-effect-on-real-estate-value-in-new-york-city-by-william-gati/>)" – by William Gati in New York Real Estate Journal September 2017

- "Understanding EMF values of business and residential locations is relatively new for the real estate industry. Cell phone towers bring extra tax revenue and better reception to a section of the city, but many are skeptical because of potential health risks and the impact on property values. Increasing numbers of people don't want to live near cell towers. In some areas with new towers, property values have decreased by up to 20%."

"Cell Tower Antennas Problematic for Buyers (<http://realtormag.realtor.org/daily-news/2014/07/25/cell-towers-antennas-problematic-for-buyers>)" published in REALTOR® Magazine:

- An overwhelming 94 percent of home buyers and renters surveyed by the National Institute for Science, Law & Public Policy (NISLAPP) say they are less interested and would pay less for a property located near a cell tower or antenna.
- The NISLAPP survey echoes the findings of a study by Sandy Bond of the New Zealand Property Institute and past president of the Pacific Rim Real Estate Society (PRRES). "The Impact of Cell Phone Towers on House Prices in Residential Neighborhoods," which was published in The Appraisal Journal in 2006, found that buyers would pay as much as 20 percent less for a property near a cell tower or antenna.

2014 Survey by the National Institute for Science, Law and Public Policy (NISLAPP) in Washington, D.C., "Neighborhood Cell Towers & Antennas—Do They Impact a Property's Desirability?"
([http://cts.businesswire.com/ct/CT?](http://cts.businesswire.com/ct/CT?id=smartlink&url=http%3A%2F%2Felectromagnetichealth.org%2Felectromagnetic-health-blog%2Fsurvey-property-desirability%2F&sheet=50899812&newsitemid=20140703005726&lan=en-US&anchor=%E2%80%9CNeighborhood+Cell+Towers+%26+Antennas%E2%80%94Do+They+Impact+a+Property%27s+Desirability%3F%E2%80%9D&index=1)

[id=smartlink&url=http%3A%2F%2Felectromagnetichealth.org%2Felectromagnetic-health-blog%2Fsurvey-property-desirability%2F&sheet=50899812&newsitemid=20140703005726&lan=en-US&anchor=%E2%80%9CNeighborhood+Cell+Towers+%26+Antennas%E2%80%94Do+They+Impact+a+Property%27s+Desirability%3F%E2%80%9D&index=1](http://cts.businesswire.com/ct/CT?id=smartlink&url=http%3A%2F%2Felectromagnetichealth.org%2Felectromagnetic-health-blog%2Fsurvey-property-desirability%2F&sheet=50899812&newsitemid=20140703005726&lan=en-US&anchor=%E2%80%9CNeighborhood+Cell+Towers+%26+Antennas%E2%80%94Do+They+Impact+a+Property%27s+Desirability%3F%E2%80%9D&index=1)

- Home buyers and renters are less interested in properties located near cell towers and antennas, as well as in properties where a cell tower or group of antennas are placed on top of or attached to a building. 94% said a nearby cell tower or group of antennas would negatively impact interest in a property or the price they would be willing to pay for it.
- Read the Press Release: Survey by the National Institute for Science, Law & Public Policy (<http://www.businesswire.com/news/home/20140703005726/en/Survey-National-Institute-Science-Law-Public-Policy#.U8muiLGO1oY>)

Cell Towers on Schools Near Homes Lower Property Valu...



NEWS ARTICLES

New York Times: "A Pushback Against Cell Towers

(http://www.nytimes.com/2010/08/29/realestate/29Lizo.html?_r=1&ref=realestate)" August 2010

"If they have the opportunity to buy another home, they do."

She said cell antennas and towers near homes affected property values, adding, "You can see a buyer's dismay over the sight of a cell tower near a home just by their expression, even if they don't say anything."

The Times of India: "Property hit where signal masts rise" July 2012

(<http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/city/delhi/Property-hit-where-signal-masts>

Property values across the city say that buildings with next mobile phone towers have 10-20% less market value.

"Forget buying these properties, people don't want to take them on rent even, particularly when they have a choice. If a person is going to invest crores, why would he buy a property with a tower?" asks Pal. According to LK Thakkar, a Defence Colony-based property dealer, while the cost of the building which has the tower is relatively less, other buildings in the vicinity also get affected. "No one wants to buy a house within 100 metres of the building which has the tower. The rates for such properties drop by 10-20%, and sometimes even more," said Thakkar, co-owner of A-One Associates."

Homeowners speak out against plans to build 2 cellphone...



STUDIES

Sandy Bond, Ph.D., Ko-Kang Wang, "The Impact of Cell Phone Towers on House Prices in Residential Neighborhoods, (<http://electromagnetichealth.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/TAJSummer05p256-277.pdf>)" The Appraisal Journal, Summer 2005; Source: Goliath business content website.

- "Overall, respondents would pay from 10%–19% less to over 20% less for a property if it were in close proximity to a CPBS."

"Cellular Phone Towers: Perceived impact on residents and property values" (http://www.prrs.net/Papers/Bond_The_Impact_Of_Cellular_Phone_Base_Station_Towers_On_Property_Values.pdf) University of Auckland, paper presented at the Ninth Pacific-Rim Real Estate Society Conference, Brisbane, Australia, January 19-22, 2003; Source: Pacific Rim Real Estate Society website,

A Field Guide to Cell Towers, The National Association of Realtors (<http://www.realtor.org/field-guides/field-guide-to-cell-phone-towers>)

The effect of distance to cell phone towers on house prices (<http://www.ci.pleasant-hill.ca.us/DocumentView.aspx?DID=5154>) S Bond, Appraisal Journal, Fall 2007, Source, Appraisal Journal (Found on page 22 (<http://www.ci.pleasant-hill.ca.us/DocumentCenter/Home/View/5154>)) See also Using GIS to Measure the Impact of Distance to Cell Phone Towers on House Prices in Florida (http://www.prrs.net/papers/Bond_Squires_Using_GIS_to_Measure.pdf)

Florida State University Law Review Volume 24 | Issue 1 Article 5 1996 The Power Line Dilemma: Compensation for Diminished Property Value Caused by Fear of Electromagnetic Fields (<http://ir.law.fsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1427&context=lr>)

New Zealand Ministry for the Environment, "Appendix 5: The Impact of Cellphone Towers on Property Values" (<http://www.mfe.govt.nz/publications/rma/nes-telecommunications-section32-aug08/html/page12.html#footnote-24>) Source: New Zealand Ministry for the Environment website

Powers, turbines and transmission lines impacts on property value edited by Sally Bond Sally Sims and Peter Dent, 2014 (http://www.clarkdale.az.gov/2015_Meetings/2015_Council/2015-05-12_Council_Regular/Public_Comment_Rcd_Karen_Daniels.pdf)

The US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) considers cell towers as "Hazards and Nuisances."

- HUD requires its certified appraisers to take the presence of nearby cell towers into

- New guidelines categorize cell towers with hazards and nuisances. New provisions prohibit underwriting of mortgages for homes that are within the engineered fall zone of a cell tower.
- "The appraiser must indicate whether the dwelling or related property improvements is located within the easement serving a high-voltage transmission line, radio/TV transmission tower, cell phone tower, microwave relay dish or tower, or satellite dish (radio, TV cable, etc)."
- Read it here at the US Department of Housing and Urban Development.
(<https://archives.hud.gov/offices/hsg/sfh/ref/sfh1-18f.cfm>)

Cell Towers are Discussed in the Written Testimony of Bobbi Borland Acting Branch Chief, HUD Santa Ana Homeownership Center Hearing before the Subcommittee on Insurance, Housing and Community Opportunity U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Financial Services on "The Impact of Overhead High Voltage Transmission Towers and Lines on Eligibility for Federal Housing Administration (FHA) Insured Mortgage Programs" Saturday, April 14, 2012
(<https://financialservices.house.gov/uploadedfiles/hhrg-112-ba04-wstate-bborland-20120414.pdf>)

- With regard to the new FHA originations, the guide provides that: "The appraiser must indicate whether the dwelling or related property improvements are located within the easement serving a high-voltage transmission line, radio/TV transmission tower, cell phone tower, microwave relay dish or tower, or satellite dish (radio, TV cable, etc)."

Once Built, Towers Could Be Allowed To Go 20 Feet Taller

Middle Class Tax Relief And Job Creation Act Of 2012, Sec. 6409(A)

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) has proposed and is currently considering rules to clarify and implement the requirements of Section 6409(a) of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012. Under section 6409(a), "a State or local government may not deny, and shall approve, any eligible facilities request for a modification of an existing wireless tower or base station that does not substantially change the physical dimensions of such tower or base station." The FCC considers eligible facilities' requests to include requests for carrier co locations and for replacing existing antennas and ground equipment with larger antennas/equipment or more antennas/equipment.

The FCC has proposed, as part of these rules, applying a four-pronged test, which could lead to cell towers increasing in height by 20-plus feet beyond their approved construction heights.

Applying the test may also lead increases in the sizes of compounds, equipment cabinets and shelters, and hazardous materials used for back-up power supplies, beyond what was originally approved.

Under this test, a "substantial increase in the size of the tower" occurs if

- 1) [t]he mounting of the proposed antenna on the tower would increase the existing height of the tower by more than 10%, or by the height of one additional antenna array with separation from the nearest existing antenna not to exceed twenty feet, whichever is greater, except that the mounting of the proposed antenna may exceed the size limits set forth in this paragraph if necessary to avoid interference with existing antennas; or
- 2) [t]he mounting of the proposed antenna would involve the installation of more than the standard number of new equipment cabinets for the technology involved, not to exceed four, or more than one new equipment shelter; or
- 3) [t]he mounting of the proposed antenna would involve adding an appurtenance to the body of the tower that would protrude from the edge of the tower more than twenty feet, or more than the width of the tower structure at the level of the appurtenance, whichever is greater, except that the mounting of the proposed antenna may exceed the size limits set forth in this paragraph if necessary to shelter the antenna from inclement weather or to connect the antenna to the tower via cable; or
- 4) [t]he mounting of the proposed antenna would involve excavation outside the current tower site, defined as the current boundaries of the leased or owned property surrounding the tower and any access or utility easements currently related to the site.

<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/document/view?id=7521070994>
(<https://ecfsapi.fcc.gov/file/7521070994.pdf>)

Liberty Township neighbors fight cell tower construction



Email us at
info@ehtrust.org
(<mailto:info@ehtrust.org>)

Mailing address

P.O. Box 58, Teton Village
WY 83025

Express mail should be sent to

7100 N Rachel Way Unit 6
Eagles Rest
Teton Village WY 83025

Copyright © 2017 Environmental Health.

About Environmental
Health Trust (EHT)
(<https://ehtrust.org/about/>)

Educate Yourself
(<https://ehtrust.org/take-action/educate-yourself/>)

Key Issues
(<https://ehtrust.org/key-issues/>)

Take Action
(<https://ehtrust.org/take-action/>)

Policy
(<https://ehtrust.org/policy/>)

Science
(<https://ehtrust.org/science/>)

Resources to Share
(<https://ehtrust.org/resources-to-share/>)

Media & Publications
(<https://ehtrust.org/publications/>)

FACEBOOK ([HTTP://FACEBOOK.COM/EHTRUST](http://facebook.com/ehtrust))
 TWITTER ([HTTP://TWITTER.COM/SAFERPHONES](http://twitter.com/saferphones))
 YOUTUBE
([HTTPS://WWW.YOUTUBE.COM/USER/WATCHEHTRUST](https://www.youtube.com/user/watchehtrust))

RECEIVED

Church Spires Point to Heaven but Deliver Hell

Mon., Sep. 18, 2017

By Jack O'Dwyer (/story/author.htm?ald=9&q=Jack O'Dwyer)

SEP 27 2017

PLANNING BOARD

Church steeples, because of their height and key in-city locations, are **GRATTON, MA** \$25K, \$50K and more yearly from telecom companies for cellphone arrays.

"Next time you pass a church, look up and take a closer look at its steeple," says DCG Real Estate, which helps churches to market themselves to telecoms. "There's a reasonably good chance it's a cell tower."

Not only are church steeples desirable locations for the telecoms, but the churches, mosques and temples appear eager to buttress their incomes in a way that involves little effort and no cost.

Early church architects, according to Religious Product News, "designed grand cathedrals and churches that had intricate, soaring steeples. The vertical lines of the steeple helped to visually enhance the lines of the church, directing the viewers' eyes vertically to the heavens." (<http://www.religiousproductnews.com>)

Churches Mum: WHB Church Has Cell Tower

Protestant, Catholic and Jewish Synagogues contacted by this reporter and EMF health advocates across the nation mostly would not return calls and emails on the subject. Not returning an email was Joseph Zwilling, PR head, Archdiocese of New York. A few individual cases of cell towers in spires were confirmed.

We learned that St. Marks Episcopal Church on Main st., West Hampton Beach, has leased its spire to telecoms. Rector Michael Ralph said the companies involved are AT&T and T-Mobile. He would not give the cost of the contracts nor length.

Our next stop was measuring, with an Acoustimeter, the radiation being emitted from the spire as we stood across the street. It was near the top of the danger zone — measuring No. 14 on a scale that went from No. 1 (0.02 volts per meter) to No. 15 (6.00 volts). No. 14 was 4.5 volts per meter. (<http://www.emfieldsolutions.com/detectors/acoustimeter.asp>)

We also visited the Westhampton Country Club across the street. Most rooms were below the danger level but one was at that level. Club officers and staff should hire one of the many services that check EMF.

Foster Raps Cell Towers in Churches, Synagogues

Susan Foster, medical researcher who has helped firefighters block cell towers on firehouses, said "Churches, synagogues and mosques are playing with the lives of people and not doing their research."

"For the time it takes to read Corinthians, they could delve into the research in the BioInitiative Report (<http://www.bioinitiative.org/>) rather than taking the word of a telecom salesperson who gets them to sign a 20-year lease without any liability coverage in case parishioners or neighbors become ill. Ministers, priests, rabbis and mullahs are putting the financial reserves of their churches at risk, but most importantly, they are risking the lives and well-being of the flock they are charged with taking care of."

"Children at church schools are especially at risk," she said. "They are bathed in powerful radiation up to eight hours a day, five days a week. Shame on the churches for ignoring the science."

President Ronald Reagan crippled EMF research when he defunded the wireless radiation research arm of the Environmental Protection Agency in the early 1980s, she said.

More Stations Needed for 4G and 5G

The new 4G and 5G cellphone antennas work over much shorter distances than earlier antennas. Hundreds of thousands of new transmitting stations will be needed, and churches are a prime target of AT&T, T-Mobile, Verizon and the other telecoms. Church steeples have been sought as stations since the early 1990s, said California Watch, which merged with revealnews.org.

There are 350,000 religious facilities in the U.S.—314,000 Protestant and Christian; 24,000 Catholic, and 12,000 mosques, temples and non-Christian.



AT&T

T-Mobile

EVERY BRAND HAS A STORY TO TELL
**Who's telling
your story?**

Talk to our healthcare experts >>

(<http://www.odwyerpr.com/ads/adclick.php?bannerid=562&zoneid=123&source=&dest=http%3A%07-26%2F4cxtgrj>)

5W
Public Relations

Want to see
**REAL
RESOURCEFUL
RESULTS?**

Click here to learn more >>

(<http://www.5wpr.com>)

We partner with clients to deliver groundbreaking programs and improve the health of people worldwide.

Your Innovation.
Our Inspiration.



(<https://biosector2.com>)

Communications
insights at your
fingertips

(<http://www.gscommunications.com/communication-insights-fingertips/>)

organizations/the-cellular-steeple-rise-cell-towers-on-churches/) in two sentences midway through a 1,073-word release. "Many people still fear that cellular towers pose a health hazard because the equipment emits levels of radiation. Although there's little evidence to support claims that cellular towers are dangerous, it is a common fear."

Colorado Parishioners Stopped Celltower

Residents of Fort Collins, Colo., in March 2016 blocked installation of a six-panel cell tower in the spire of the LifePointe Church. Residents said, "Like more than 100,000 times since 2004, a major cellular carrier once again was pushing for greater cell coverage for their network. While the approval process for new cell towers has come to be a slam dunk in the US, this time things would be different.

The installation was blocked.

At issue were the potential health impacts from the cell tower's close proximity to a residential community and Leshar Middle School, which lay 150 yards west of the church. Meanwhile, residents had uncovered more than 6,000 studies showing harm from electromagnetic radiation (EMR).

All this coupled with the emergence of new science emboldened the community to speak out.

Local media reported: "In the weeks leading up to the community meeting, Heather Lahdenpera had worked tirelessly to first alert the community of the impending decision, and then catalyze broad engagement across more than one-third of the residents nearby. What makes this so spectacular is that few communities have acted with so much passion and resolve since the Telecommunications Act of 1996 took away the rights of citizens to challenge the siting of a cell tower based on health concerns."

Category: Healthcare PR (/story/category/20/healthcare-pr.html)

Return to Sep. 18, 2017 News (/story/2017-09-18.html)

Return to Latest News (/story/index.html)

Submit a Comment

Your
Comment

Your Comment

Name

Your Name

Email

Email Address

(Email address will not be published)

Website

Website

Image Text

I'm not a robot

reCAPTCHA
Privacy Terms

Leave Comment

Comments

Sep. 23, 2017, by John C.

Most people using churches have only brief exposure, an hour or two a week, so even if there was some health concern, it's limited by brief exposure and distance. I wouldn't want to be in Quasimodo's boots but I don't think ordinary churchgoers are in danger. And to be extra cautious you could reduce the broadcast signal strength during services.

Sep. 20, 2017, by Rene A. Henry

Why are the mainstream media ignoring this story? This could be as big or even bigger than the Roman Catholic church harboring and protecting pedophile priests. Thank you Jack O'Dwyer for getting this story out!

Sep. 19, 2017, by Ellis Evans

This is a timely article in view of the imminent roll-out of 5G transmitter antennas and the IOT (internet of things). In 2015 I asked the Archbishops Council here in the UK (church body responsible for these issues) the very same questions. I publish their response below. Please note, they are either (a) ignorant of any of these issues (b) do not care (c) a money making organisation above all things or (d) all of the above.

Thank you for your letter addressed to the Archbishops, Council in which you urged caution over the installation of mobile phone masts on church buildings, and for the attached documents.

in the granting of a faculty (or not) for an installation. These decisions are taken bearing in mind all relevant representations made to the court including information relevant to public health and safety.

Neither the Archbishops, Council nor the Church Buildings Council offers blanket support for the installation of mobile phone antennas in church buildings. Each case is considered on its merits.

Yours sincerely

David Knight

Dr David Knight

Senior Church Buildings Officer

Cathedral and Church Buildings Division, Church House,

Great Smith Street, London SW1P 3AZ

In years to come, it will be an easy task for researchers to apportion a 400 m circle around the steeple of churches hosting mobile phone transmitting antennas and map out case after case of cancers, symptoms of ill-ease, dis-ease and EHS (electro-hyper-sensitivity).

Local planning departments have been neutered by government policy which says that any planning application by the telecoms industries can only be stopped on 'aesthetic grounds'. In other words, safety and well-being are not valid reasons for refusing these applications - safety is not even discussed.

I also sent this dossier to English Heritage who are responsible for thousands of historic buildings across the UK. I still await their reply and this response typifies organisations that value money over health and prefer to stick their heads in the sand or keep their mouths firmly in the trough of easy money.

As a society we need to challenge and change these issues and dissolve the corrupt collusion of the telecoms giants and government in telling us what is and what is not safe.

Sep. 18, 2017, by Susan Foster

I would love to hear from ministers, priests, rabbis across the country as to WHY they ignore the science. What is it that influences them so much that they will commit to a 20 year lease for a cell tower that emits a 2b carcinogen? I am mystified. I truly want to hear what the telecom salesmen and women say that invites this blind trust in the telecom industry?

All church leaders study religion. Why not study the science? We ignore science at our peril. Our government has a vested interest in minimizing the risks. Wireless is driving the economy in many ways. I get that. But who is going to be healthy enough to enjoy the fruits of a healthy economy if this radiation saturation continues? Don't church leaders have a higher moral responsibility than the city that rents out space on top of the town water tower?

Sep. 18, 2017, by Dave Ashton

I live in the UK, and the problem of wifi and cellular antennas being hidden in church steeples and so on is as endemic here as it is in the US.

I recently came upon a website - Law & Religion UK - in which the issue is discussed. In one particular case, in Norwich, a hearing of the "Consistory Court" was held in order to consider the application by WiSpire to install wifi transmitters in a church (see "Re All Saints Postwick" via the 1st link below).

WiSpire employed two experts to defend its application; one was from the UK's Advisory Group on Non-Ionising Radiation, a now-defunct group that has recently been criticised by Sarah Starkey for its conflicts of interest and scientific cherry-picking (see <https://www.degruyter.com/downloadpdf/j/reveh.2016.31.issue-4/reveh-2016-0060/reveh-2016-0060.pdf> (<https://www.degruyter.com/downloadpdf/j/reveh.2016.31.issue-4/reveh-2016-0060/reveh-2016-0060.pdf>)), and the other was Dr James Rubin, a psychologist with a long and consistent history of claiming that electromagnetic hypersensitivity (EHS) is a "nocebo effect" - i.e. a mistaken belief that the disabling symptoms are linked to the pulsed microwave radiation from wireless devices.

As you can see from the 2nd link below, health is not to be considered an issue in such matters:

"If in any given case the ICNIRP [International Commission on Non-Ionising Radiation Protection] [international] guidelines are met the planning authority should not have to look further in relation either to an actual health risk or perceived health risks. The rationale of the policy is the first sentence which, to my mind, is important for an understanding of the whole. There, the Secretary of State says this:

"It is the Government's firm view that the planning system is not the place for determining health safeguards."

In other words, the non-ionising radiation protection advice of ICNIRP - a private, industry and military-friendly group which includes conflicted members, and which consistently fails to implement precautionary exposure levels through its insistence that non-thermal effects do not, and cannot, exist (despite all of the scientific evidence to the contrary) - is used as a justification for allowing microwave-emitting technologies into churches, where they irradiate church-goers and the general public alike.

This is hugely convenient for the churches, which can then use the juicy revenues to offset increasingly empty collection plates due to falling attendances, without worrying too deeply about

<http://www.lawandreligionuk.com/2017/09/07/consistory-court-evidence-or-call-my-bluff-episode-2/>
(<http://www.lawandreligionuk.com/2017/09/07/consistory-court-evidence-or-call-my-bluff-episode-2/>)

Wi-Fi in churches: health effects, courts, jurisdiction and locus standi

<http://www.lawandreligionuk.com/2015/01/08/wi-fi-in-churches-health-effects-courts-jurisdiction-and-locus-standi/> (<http://www.lawandreligionuk.com/2015/01/08/wi-fi-in-churches-health-effects-courts-jurisdiction-and-locus-standi/>)

Wi-Fi in churches: evidence, system security and commercial considerations

<http://www.lawandreligionuk.com/2015/01/13/wi-fi-in-churches-evidence-system-security-and-commercial-considerations/> (<http://www.lawandreligionuk.com/2015/01/13/wi-fi-in-churches-evidence-system-security-and-commercial-considerations/>)

WE DON'T
WAIT FOR
WHAT'S NEXT.
WE DEFINE IT.

At Weber Shandwick, we live in perpetual beta. We strive not only to define what's next, but to define what's possible – for our clients, our business, and the world around us. Because those who hesitate can't innovate.



(<http://www.odwyerpr.com/ads/adclick.php?>

bannerid=560&zoneid=54&source=&dest=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.webershandwick.com)

Subscribe (https://www.odwyerpr.com/order_form/member_signup.html)

Editorial Contacts (http://www.odwyerpr.com/contact_odwyers/contact.htm)

Publications (https://www.odwyerpr.com/order_form/orderform.html) Advertise (http://www.odwyerpr.com/site_info/advertising.htm)

Contact Us (http://www.odwyerpr.com/contact_odwyers/contact_odwyers.htm)

(<http://www.facebook.com/odwyerpr>)

(<http://www.twitter.com/odwyerpr>)

(<http://feeds.feedburner.com/PR-Blog>)

Need Help? john@odwyerpr.com (<mailto:john@odwyerpr.com>)

271 Madison Ave., #600
New York, NY 10016

Tel: 212/679-2471

Copyright © 1998-2017
J.R. O'Dwyer Company, Inc.

Terms & Conditions (http://www.odwyerpr.com/terms_conditions.htm)

